FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1896.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for ublication wish to have rejected articles returned,

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Prize and New York Associated Prizes is at 21 to 25 ann street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

### What the High Commission Will Do.

In its efforts to underrate the importance of the High Commission, the London Times has been led into a remarkable statement.

It says, to quote the telegraphed summary of its words, that President CLEVELAND first called upon Congress to appoint a commission to determine the true divisional line between British Guiana and Venezuela: but that "Ambassador BAYARD now says the Commission's only function is to collect facts for the information of the President;" and further that "it was in response to the latter view that Lord Salisbury promised to furnish the British documents to the Commission.

Whatever the truth in regard to Mr. BAYARD's conduct in this matter, there is no doubt as to what the High Commission is to do. The duty which the London Times ascribes to it was suggested by the Foreign Committee of the Senate, but was rejected by the Senate. The committee's substitute for the House bill provided for a sommission which should "investigate and report to the President the facts in regard to the divisional line" between Venezuela and British Guiana. But the House bill provided for a commission "to investigate and report upon the true divisional line: and this latter was the language concurred in by the Senate, the proposed substitute of its own committee being laid upon the table, and the Chairman of that committee, before the debate was closed, announcing that he should vote for rejecting the substitute.

Thus it is misleading to say that "the Commission's only function is to collect facts for the information of the President; it is to perform a duty which the President himself has described in these words:

"The dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measured." ine with sufficient certainty for its putification what is the true divisional line between

The result of its labors will probably be embodied in a line drawn on the map; and that line will stand, in the absence of some other line to be determined by that arbitration which England now rejects, as the line showing whether she is or is not violating the Monroe doctrine on these continents. On this point another citation from the President's message will be timely:

"When such report is made and accepted, it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist, by every means in its power, as a wilful aggress upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands, or the exercise of gove on over any territory, whi nvestigation, we have determined by right belong

A further indication that such a line will be drawn, and not merely documentary evidence collected for information, is fur nished in the official announcement recently made from Washington that "the chart upon which the Commission will mark its true divisional line has been completed, and was laid before the meeting to-day."

The desire of England and of Anglomaniacs here to substitute for the High Commission established by Congress a "Joint Commission of Conciliation." with its functions limited to gabble, while England still holds on to her unlawful settle ments, is quite intelligible. But we are a long way beyond that stage of the affair.

## Ten Dollars' Worth of Disloyalty.

The projectors of the movement for the establishment of an international court of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between America and Great Britain, have started out in an unfortunate way. They have begun by insulting patriotic American sentiment.

At the meeting they held in this city on Tuesday, for the purpose of organization, they appointed as the Chairman of their Executive Committee a man who is notorious as one of the editors of a newspaper which persistently ridicules and maligns this country, its institutions, and its civilization, and invariably takes the side of England in its controversics with us, assailing our positions with the virulence characteristic of such treachery. This man is HORACE WHITE, one of the editors of the Evening Post, and he could have been se lected as such Chairman for no other reason than that he represents the malignant bostility of that paper toward this country. Otherwise he would not have been thought of for the place, for he has neither the ability nor the distinction which would suggest to any one his appointment to it. He is known only to a limited circle, and to them only as playing second fiddle to the notorious GODKIN.

Mr. WHITE himself recognized the blunder made in putting him forward thus conspicuously in the arbitration movement, and declined the Chairmanship, though he remains one of the committee. But he could not do even that without seizing the opportunity to make a new exhibition of his Copperhead spirit. He tried to get subscriptions for a fund to pay for a public meeting to protest against the strengthening of our navy and our coast defences. He wanted this country to be so weak that it would be unable to defend itself against England, and therefore compelled to submit to arbitration, if England should graciously grant it the privilege. He offered to subscribe \*\$10 or more" for that dastardly purpose, and suggested that the arbitration meeting should put up the rest of the money required; but the disloyal proposition was too much for the decent Americans, and WHITE's infamous remarks were ruled out of order.

## John Bull and the Barbarians.

In order to get the extreme British view of any dispute between England and the United States, and in fact of almost any international dispute, it is only necessary to observe what the Evening Post of this city proposes and supports.

While the Government and people of the United States are urging Great Britain to resort to arbitration with Venezuela, as a substitute for war, the Post seeks to dis qualify Venezuela as an equal party to arbitration in this way:

"We believe the transfer of any considerable body of bens-fide residents from a civilized to a semi-bar-barous Government such as Venezueia is, pace Secretary Opera, would be an unprecedented act. It has long been a rule of Christendom not to hand over its own subjects to barbarians, and not to leave them subject to barbarian jurisdiction even as sojourners in the barbarian country. We do not see how Lord my can possibly break through this rule."

the plea that the Venezuelans are barbarians, from whom Christians have a right to take their lands. And it is within the last twelve years that the encroachments of Great Britain have been made upon the tract which was to have been kept neutral. This tract is mentioned in the agreement of Mr. BELFORD HINTON WILSON, as Charge d'Affaires, dated Nov. 18, 1850, which declared that "her Majesty's Government, as above stated, will not order or sanction such occupations or encroachments on the part of British authorities." The diplomatic correspondence shows that the encroachments which caused Venezuela to break off friendly intercourse with Great Britain began in October, 1884, and they were thus summarized in a despatch of Mr. URRANEJA, the Venezuelan Foreign Minis-

ter, dated Feb. 20, 1887: "Great Britain has violated Venezuelan territory "Great Britain has violated Venezuelan territory by entering the same through prohibited places; by appointing constables, establishing Government offices over which files the English flag; by carrying off, trying, and punishing a Venezuelan official; by sending thither, accompanied by an armed police force, a magistrate who has proclaimed those places to be British; by decreeing prohibitions of commerce; by having a revenue cutter to cruise in the space which lies between Amacuro and Itarima, comprising these rivers within the jurisdiction of the Governor of Demerara; and by authorizing the development of mines enclosed within the soil of the repub ic, and by exercising other acts of dominion.

Great Britain has taken upon herself the right of deciding for and by herself, and in her own favor, a question which regards her as much as it does Venes

"Great Britain has declared herself to be the or proprietor of the Orinoco, the great fluvial artery of the north of South America, by taking possession of Branch Barima, one of its mouths, and, by this means, of the commerce of vast regions belonging to variou

The protest which Venezuela at that time nade to the world was not that Great Britain entertained different views from her as to where the divisional line ran, for that was an old subject of controversy, but that she was seizing and settling the disputed tract by her superior force, while refusing to let an unprejudiced third party decide between them.

This is the sort of settlement which the Post represents as an advance of Christendom into a country of barbarians, such as makes it impossible ever to give up what has been so seized and settled. On the other hand, if the barbarians of Caracas have also simed or should aim at actual or constructive encroachment upon any part of the disputed tract, this cannot be allowed, because it has already been annexed to Christendom, by the hand of JOHN BULL. All this is truly British logic, worthy of a British organ.

#### The Monroe Doctrine on Trial at New Haven.

The esteemed contemporary who occupies the chair of international law at Yale University has given to the public, in the February number of the Forum, his opinion of the Monroe doctrine and of President CLEVELAND'S application of it to the British encroachment in Venezuela. Inverting the rational order of these questions, however, he tells us what he thinks of the President's application of the doctrine before he tells us what he thinks the doctrine is. In this inversion we prefer not to follow him. We notice his deliverance at all only because it offers a favorable occasion to isolate the principle of the Monroe doctrine. The commentators have got it badly mixed. Everybody understands the Monroe doctrine till he attempts to explain it to somebody else; then nobody understands it. The comment, and not the text, confounds us. The public as to this matter is very much in the situation of the old lady reading BUN-YAN'S Pilgrim's Progress with Scott's Explanatory Notes. She said she understood everything but the explanations.

Among the declarations of President Mon-ROE, in his annual message of Dec. 2, 1823, which announced what is known as the Monroe doctrine, the first in order and the most general in form is this:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which t to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.'

The full meaning of this fundamental declaration is so plain that he may run who eads it. If the rights and interests of the United States require that the American continents shall not be considered as subjects for colonization by any European power, they require that those continents shall not be considered as subjects for the acquisition of territory or dominion by a European power in any other peaceable mode, much more by force; for it would be absurd to hold that our rights and interests in this respect are menaced by colonization, and not by cession or by conquest. The declaration asserts, then, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that no Euro pean power, by any means, whether by colonization, by cession, by conquest, by intrigue, or by artifice, shall extend its dominion in this hemisphere. This is the principle of the Monroe doctrine. The declarations respecting the South American States in the same message simply deal with an application of this principle to the threatened intervention of the Allied Powers, though incidentally reasserting the principle in its utmost extent, in affirming that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." The principle is thus outlined in

each of its original applications. It surely is unnecessary to emphasize the distinction between a principle and the application of a principle. Yet at this point we may excusably dwell on it for a moment. Mr. Monroe's declarations not only assert a principle but specify two applications of it, both typical. The principle, as we have seen, is that the rights and interests of the United States forbid the extension of European dominion in this hemisphere. principle is applied specifically, first, to European colonization, typical of peaceable extension, and, secondly, to European intervention, typical of forcible extension. Neither of those cases under the Monroe doctrine is at present formidable; but the Monroe doctrine, nevertheless, remains in undiminished force, ready to be applied to either of them, or to any other case that may arise under it. Cases may come and cases may go, but the principle abides.

Such is the plain import of the famous declarations which set forth the Monroe doctrine. Such is the Monroe doctrine in its logical simplicity.

Not so, thinks our Professor. Referring to President MONROE, in connection with the scheme of the Allied Powers, he says: "He announced a policy. That policy forbade the substitution of monarchical for republican forms of government on this continent by European force.

• • It did not forbid any step which the republics themselves choose to take, but simply what was forced upon them. It was the policy which fitted the ou\_and the occasion. It was opportunism.

This is to confound the Monroe doctrine with one of its applications. If the learned Professor, in view of the foregoing exposi-The diplomatic correspondence of the last | tion, does not appreciate the blunder he reason with him further; if he does,

argument is unnecessary. The Monroe doctrine is a policy beyond dispute. But "opportunism" is not a policy; it is the negation of one. A policy is a system or settled method of conduct: opportunism is the practice of taking advantage of opportunities as they turn up, living politically, as vagabonds live individually, from hand to mouth. Is this seriously our distinguished Yale Professor's conception of the Monroe doctrine? Is this his notion of a policy?

So it would seem; for he endeavors to fortify the opinion by citing Mr. Calhoun, who, he says, was "in a position to know what the Monroe decarations meant and to what they were applicable," and whom he represents approvingly as regarding the Monroe docrine as "a policy only, to be followed or not as interest dictated," This citation has little or no value: but, as Mr. CALHOUN'S remarks have been thought worthy of a foot note in Lawrence's Wheaton, we will not pass them wholly by. Besides, the point may be said to have a shade of historical interest. As a member of President MONROE's Cabinet, Mr. CALHOUN no doubt was "in a position to know," and at the time pretty certainly did know better than this, "I have understood from good authority," said Mr. WEBSTER, speaking of the Monroe doctrine a little more than two years after its enunciation, "that it was considered, weighed, and distinctly and decidedly approved by every one of the Presi-

dent's advisers at that time." When Mr. CALHOUN, in 1848, undertook to recall his experiences of that time however, a quarter of a century had passed, and it may well have been that they came back to him imperfect, especially as his functions in the Cabinet, as the Secretary of War, did not bring him into close relation with the in this application and of it; it is nothing foreign policy of the Administration, and more especially as he had been for nearly the whole of the intervening period in unrelenting antagonism to the statesmen who more than all others were the sponsors and champions of the Monroe doctrine. His evidence is weakened by relative inferiority in the opportunities of knowing, by the lapse of time and by inveterate prejudice, Moreover, the gist of his evidence, as the outcome, no doubt, of this triple defect, embodies a self-contradiction. The member of President MONROE's Cabinet who knew most about the Monroe doctrine, and who, if we may trust political tradition, countenanced by official usage, to say nothing of official duty, had more to do with formulating the doctrine than President MONROE himself, was the Secretary of State, John QUINCY ADAMS of Massachusetts. He unquestionably could speak on the subject with authority. And he did speak, not merely by words, but by actions

The next year after the declaration of the Monroe doctrine, Mr. ADAMS was chosen as Mr. MONROE'S successor in the Presidency, and one of the first acts of his Administration in relation to foreign nations, and perhaps the most signal act of his Administration in any relation, was to reassert the Monroe doctrine in the sense here ascribed to it, with the additional application of that doctrine to the purchase of Cuba from Spain by another European power, following it up by the appointment of Commissioners to the Panama congress, convoked expressly to promote, among other objects the effectual operation of the doctrine in its length and breadth. In this action President ADAMS was zealously sustained throughout by CLAY in the Cabinet and by Webster in the Senate, both of whom were 'in a position to know" everything there was to know in the councils of President Mon-BOE, and who told what they knew not to posterity only, but primarily to their immediate contemporaries. On the question as to the Monroe construction of the Monroe doctrine the contemporaneous and concurrent testimony of ADAMS, CLAY, and WEB-STER is decisive. As to the justness of that construction, the Monroe declarations speak for it and for themselves.

So much for the view of the Monroe trine taken from the chair of international law at Yale. Contracted and self-contradictory as the view is, the occupant of the chair is constrained to admit that the Monroe doctrine, even thus narrowed and degraded, if in this condition it may be called a doctrine, applies literally to the Venezuelan question, though it does not, he strangely contends, apply in reality. The reasoning by which he supports this proposition, we must be pardoned for saying, is such as seldom emanates from a person of common sense or from an educated person without common sense. Quoting President CLEVELAND'S application of the Monroe doctrine to the ques-

tion of the Venezuelan boundary, he remarks "The argument is perfectly clear and needs no clab oration. An unsettled boundary dispute between a British colony and Venezuela, a disposition to 'edge up' on the latter in the matter of territory, is an attempt to extend the European system to a sister re-public and to control her destiny. On the face of it, this is a possible inference, but only by emphasizing the letter, not the spirit and real intent, of Mosnog's message, and by almost a perversion of words. Apply the same language to our Maine boundary. The val-ley of the St. John was disputed ground. By the Ashourton compromise it was divided between the dis putants. Is it a proper use of language to say that the success of Great Britain in acquiring the country north of the St. John River to the St. Lawrence watershed, which we had justly claimed, extends a European system to the United States or controls its destiny Venezueia's is a perfectly parallel case. Were we to lose the whole region in dispute by arbitration or by aggression, in neither case would a new system be extended over her, or her destiny be controlled."

In this case, if we may venture to face the appalling confusion of thought it presents, the territory lost by arbitration or by compromise would be no longer in dispute. but the acknowledged territory of Great Britain which, of course, in taking possession of her own would not extend her system to Venezuela or any part of Venezuela; but the territory lost by aggression would be territory still claimed by Venezuela and wrested from her by Great Britain, which, accordingly, would extend her system to so much of Venezuela as she had seized, thereby directly controlling the destiny of this part and indirectly the destiny of the whole. The case of Venezuela, so far from being parallel to that of Maine, is rather at right angles to it. In the case of Maine, as produced by our Professor, Great Britain did no more than occupy the territory ceded to her by treaty; in the case of Venezuela, on the contrary, Great Britain occupies the territory in dispute, refuses to submit her claim to arbitration, and squares off in its defence against the victim she has despoiled. The distinction between the two cases involves the venerable distinction of meum et tuum. In the one case Great Britain observed this distinction; in the other she tramples on it. Our Professor, we hope, will at least recognize it without the necessity of a formal exposition. He asks innocently if it is a proper use of language to say that Great Britain. in taking possession of the territory ceded to her by the treaty of Washington, extended her system to any portion of the United States? We have no hesitation in saying that it is not; it is a piece of stupidity as tem to any portion of the United States had she seized the valley of the St. John, rejected arbitration, scorned concession, and maintained her seizure by force and arms. We now come to what this international lawyer calls "the vital point of the whole

matter." He shall present it himself: "We may grant, though contrary to fact, that the donroe doctrine is applicable to the Venezuelan coundary dispute. Proof must atill be furnished that a failure to enforce it would endanger our peace and safety. If they are not so endangered, we have no ground for interference. The Monroe doctrine de-clares this. President CLEVELAND implies it. The commentators who have been quoted say it. Does British control over the wild frontier region in dispute be-tween Venezuela and Guiana really threaten the safety of the United States? If so, why and how? We are entitled to specifications. For, unless the langer can be shown, an interference is unwarranted. Does Canada put our institutions in jeopardy? Does British Columbia imperil our form of government? If not, why does this danger lurk in distant Guiana? England has as constitutional a form of government as our own. She is a good coloniser. Are such developments inimical to our safety 7'

This he esteems his crowning argument It is an argument, we scarcely need point out, not against the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine in the Venezuelan case, as he supposes, but against the Monroe doctrine as a doctrine; not against the enforcement of the doctrine in any special case, but against the doctrine itself. The argument, if sound, abolishes the Monroe doctrine by reducing it to opportunism, which we have seen is no doctrine at all, and no policy, but the opposite of both. He reasons from the standpoint of the abstract right of self-defence, which he mistakes for the Monroe doctrine, instead of from the application of that right which constitutes the doctrine; for the Monroe doctrine is nothing except a fixed and definite application of the right of self-defence against the extension of European dominion in America. The Monroe doctrine consists more, nothing less. The expediency of thus applying the right of self-defence is settled. It is not an open question. It was closed three-quarters of a century ago, when the people of the United States ratified by acclamation the doctrine of which this applica-

ion is the alpha and omega. What we of the present day have to do, therefore, when a particular extension of European dominion in this hemisphere comes in view, is to decide whether or not it is what it seems, and if it is, to resist it; to ascertain definitely whether the Monroe doctrine applies or not, and if it does, to apply it. We have not to decide anew, with every new case, whether or not the Monroe doc trine, if violated, shall be enforced; whether the extension of European dominion in America shall be resisted or not; whether resistance to the extension of European dominion in America is a proper or an improper exercise of the international right of self-defence. That was decided once for all by our fathers, whose decision we have made our own by approving the Monroe doctrine. It is our concern to execute the Monroe doctrine; not to institute it, not to reconstruct it, not to revoke it, and above all not to subvert it by resolving it back into the natural right from which it is derived, leaving behind no formulated word to warn others or

to guide ourselves. As for the mere insignificance or alleged insignificance of the territory in dispute, the obvious answer is conclusive. The territory, in point of fact, is larger than New York New Jersey, and Pennsylvania together but if it were one square mile, instead of one hundred thousand square miles, as British authority reports it to be, we could not with safety or honor submit to its wrongful seizure by a European power, even though it be, what our Professor naïvely assures us that Great Britain is. " a good colonizer." By the way, "good colonizer" is good. Resenting wrongs to pass a wrong is like stopping leaks. The leak neglected may presently become a breach that no hand can close. A nation that sub mits to a little wrong, will soon have a great one to resist. Resist beginnings. This is statesmanship. This is patriotism. This is wisdom. This is honor. This is safety.

Our Professor's "vital out, is as void of vitality as a doornail. His crowning argument is not less fallacious than the arguments it crowns. Like every one of these, it is an egregious fallacy, not to say a glaring contradiction. It is precisely as if he had granted the applicability of a law, and then argued against the enforcement of the law by disputing its policy and denying its enactment.

However, having guarded against miscon struction, as we trust, by making this point thrice clear, we have no objection to step down from the Monroe doctrine for the nonce and step back with him to the considerations which brought about the doctrine in its application to the extension of European dominion in this hemisphere by colonization, the application which, to superficial minds, whose cosmopolitanism is at least as strong as their patriotism, may seem the most arbitrary. We shall find those considerations briefly stated in President ADAMS's special message of March 15, 1826, from which we extract this passage

"The late President of the United States, in his nessage to Congress of the second of December, 1823. white announcing the negotiation then pending with Russia, relating to the northwest coast of this conti-nent, observes that the occasion of the discussions to which that incident had given rise had been taken for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and in terests of the United States were involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they had assumed and maintained, were thenceforward not to be considered subjects for col nization by any European power. The principle had first been assumed in that negotiation with Russia. It rested upon a course of reasoning equally simple and conclusive. With the exception of the existing European colonies, which it was in nowise intended to disturb, the two continents consisted of several sovereign and independent nations, whose territories cov ered their whole surface. By this their independen condition the United States enjoyed the right of commercial intercourse with every part of their possess sions. To attempt the establishment of a colony in those possessions would be to usurp, to the exclusion of others, a commercial intercourse which was the common possession of all. It could not be done without encroaching upon existing rights of the United

These considerations, of course, apply also to the Monroe doctrine in its other applications, reënforced in some of them by manifest considerations of national security, as mentioned by President MONROE, which the shallowest cosmopolitan could not refuse to acknowledge, and would hardly hold cheap. In short, the doctrine is called for by our "peace and safety" as well as by our "rights and interests," a disregard for either of which would endanger both. But enough. Our Professor, in his Quixotic tilt at the Monroe doctrine, calls for "specifications." Under protest, and ex gratia, we submit them. His demand for them is illogical, and so, perhaps, is our compliance, but, if one may judge from his arguments in the Forum, he will not think the worse of it on that account.

By way of postscript to this article, and as a matter of historical significance, we invite attention to President ADAMS's remark in the above-quoted passage that " the principle had first been assumed in that negotiation with Russia." That negetiation with Russia had been conducted by Mr. ADAMS. asinine as it would be to say that Great as President Monnoe's Secretary of State,

avowing the authorship of the Monroe doctrine. For our own part, we have little doubt that he was in fact the author. Be this as it may, Mr. CANNING's suggestion to Mr. RUSH concerning the Allied Powers, Mr. Rush's report of it to his Government, and President Monnog's incorporation of it into his message, were merely steps in particular application of the principle. although the emergency which called forth this application and the world-wide interest which the application excited, have served not only to push into the background the application of the principle to European colonization in this hemisphere, but to overshadow the principle itself. But it is chiefly the expositors and professors of international law who have failed to penetrate the shadow. The country at large and the world at large have never lost sight of the principle. The mass of civilized mankind from the first have understood perfectly that the Monroe doctrine is simply resistance to the extension of European dominion in America. It is the academic world that has lacked the gumption to grasp this fact. 'These be thy gods, O Israel." In our opinion it is time these blind leaders of those who see were turned down.

#### The Deadlock in France.

When, on Saturday, the French Senate for the second time passed a vote of want of confidence in the BOURGEOIS Cabinet, it raised a constitutional question of uncommon gravity. Naturally, the London newspapers, and those who rely on them for information, are all at sea upon the subject, as their deader writers have never given evidence of familiarity with the circumstances ander which the French Constitution of 1875 was constructed, or with the history of its subsequent workings. Before examining the constitutional ques-

tion raised by the bribe takers, who apparently control the Senate, in the hope of escaping the investigation and punishment with which they are threatened, we should mention that the Minister of Justice, M. RICARD, is undoubtedly chargeable with a technical error, of which the most has been made by his assailants. He has publicly asserted that the transfer of the investigation of the Southern Railway affair from the easy-going Judge REMPLER to the inexorable Judge POITEVIN was made with the former's consent. It turns out that when the Public Prosecutor approached Judge REMPLER on the matter, that examining magistrate expressed satisfaction at being relieved from an unpleasant duty, but added that he would file a protest as a matter of form, and in order to avert the estab lishment of a precedent. The Public Prosecutor, in reporting the result of the interview to the Minister of Justice, confined himself to affirming the acquiescence of Judge REMPLER in the proposed substi tution of Judge Poitevin, but omitted to mention the filing of the formal protest Thus it came to pass that when, on Saturday, the principal assailant of the Cabinet in the Senate proved the existence of the protest, he placed M. RICARD in an awkward position; for the latter, although morally guiltless, is technically responsible for the sin of omission committed by his subordinate, the Public Prosecutor. Under ordinary circumstances such an incident could be quickly disposed of by the resignation of M. RICARD and the substitution of an equally unflinching pursuer of evildoers in the post of Minister of Justice. But such a solution of the matter would not at all suit the Opportunists, who are still dominant in the Senate, for their aim is to put an end to the probing of railway and canal scandals by overthrowing the BOURGEOIS Ministry. To that end they have simply made M. RICARD's unintended suppression of a fact the pretext for a violent attack on the whole Cabinet.

deference to the vote of censure twice passed by them, M. Bourgeois and all his colleagues are bound to retire from office. That is to say, they maintain that in a sysvernment based upon the principle of Ministerial responsibility, the Ministers are as directly and fully accountable to the upper House as they are to the popular branch of the Legislature. In no other country possessing the parliamentary as distinguished from the presidential type of government would such a pretension be for a moment raised Neither in England, nor in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Prussia, the Cisleithan half of the Hapsburg dominion, Hungary, Sweden, Norway, nor any other country which has formed its parliamentary institutions on the English pattern, does a Ministry hold itself obliged to resign owing to the defeat of its measures by the upper House, or even owing to an explicit vote of want of confidence by that body. Experience has shown that parliamentary government would be impossible under conditions of such divided responsibility. Even France does not in practice constitute an exception to the rule. although in theory it does. To understand why, theoretically, the

The majority of the Senate hold that, in

present French Constitution imposes upon Ministers the impossible task of serving two masters, we should recall the circumstances under which the instrument was framed. When the reactionist majority of the Versailles Assembly constructed the Constitution of 1875 they deliberately undertook to build a political machine which should become unworkable the moment they lost control of it. They accordingly arranged that Ministers, instead of being accountable to the Chamber of Deputies alone, should be accountable also to the Senate, precautions supposed to be effectual having been taken to assure to the relictionists perpetual predominance in the upper House by provisions that part of the Senators should hold their seats for life, while the rest were to be chosen by strictly limited constituencies believed to be proof against democratic sympathies. It was expected that the effect of this system of divided responsibility would be that everything would go smoothly so long as the relictionists controlled both branches of the Legislature, but that the whole machinery would go to wreck the moment they were beaten in the Chamber of Deputies. The decisive overthrow of the relictionists in the lower House occurred at the general election in the autumn of 1877. when GAMBETTA and his friends inflicted an irreparable defeat on the BROGLIE-FOURTOU combination at the ballot box. At that time the forces of reaction were supposed to be still impregnably lodged in the Senate, but a deadlock was averted through President McMahon's selection of M. DUFAURE, a Moderate Republican of universally respected character and eminent abilities, for the post of Premier. During M. DUFAURE'S term of office such changes took place in the composition of the Senate, that when at last the Opportunists laid hands upon the executive power, which, under one leader or another, they were to hold for some seventeen years, they had already acquired a slight majority in the upper House.

For that reason there has been no deadlock between the two branches of the French

hour. Not that the two Houses have al ways been agreed; far from it. The Senate has often thrown out, or insisted upon amending, measures sent to it by the Chamber of Deputies; but never on that account has a Ministry resigned. On the other hand, never before has the Senate gone so far as to pass an explicit vote of want of confidence in a given Cabinet, and thereby to expose the Constitution of 1875 to the precise risk of dislocation contemplated by the relictionists. If the present French Constitution has proved workable for twenty years, it is just because the fatal principle of divided responsibility has never before been resolutely invoked; and the French people, could they now make themselves heard in a constitutional way, would undoubtedly uphold M. BOURGEOIS and his colleagues in their position that the principle, inherently absurd, condemned by history, and devised by enemies of the republic, is now a dead letter, having been extinguished by non-user. There is nothing that M. Boun-GEOIS could more heartily wish for than to be allowed to appeal forthwith to the French people on the naked issue, whether the responsibility of Ministers should not be limited to the people's direct representatives in the Chamber of Deputies. Unfortunately, such an appeal cannot be lawfully made if the Opportunist majority in the Senate shall stand firm. For among the anti-democratic contrivances inserted by the relictionists in the Constitution of 1875 was a provision making the consent of the Senate a prerequisite to the dissolving of Parliament by the President. The same obstruction confronts those who would limit Ministerial responsibility to the Chamber of Deputies by a constitutional amendment; for the consent of the Senate is necessary to the meeting of both Houses in joint session for the purpose of revising the Constitution.

The consent to either a dissolution of Parliament or to a revision of the Constitution is scarcely to be expected from the Opportunist majority in the Senate, because most of its leaders are known, or are suspected, to be mixed up in railway or canal scandals; and, consequently, it is for them a matter of political life or death to drive M Bourgeois and his colleagues out of office

by maintaining a deadlock in legislation. The seriousness of the existing situation in Paris would only be partially lessened by M. RICARD's resignation. The gravity of it is due to the fact that so long as the Senate shall adhere to its vote of want of confidence, a constitutional solution of the crisis will be unattainable; while if the Ministers are heartily sustained by the Chamber of Deputies they will be tempted to cut the knot by a revolution, the chief aim of which would e the summary abolition of the Senate.

#### The Jersey Republicans.

The Republican State Convention to elect delegates to St. Louis has been called to meet in Trenton on April 18. No little influence is likely to be exercised by the Re publican Jerseymen, whose twenty delegates will appear under conditions which are much more favorable to them than has been the case for many years in a National Convention. New Jersey has now, as it has had but once before since 1860, a Re publican Governor. The Legislature of the State is overwhelmingly Republican. The term of the Governor does not expire until January, 1899, and the Republicans are claiming the electoral votes of the Blue Ribbon State with much more confidence than in any previous election for many years. From 1852 to 1892, uniformly, except in 1872, the Democrats carried New Jersey in every Presidential contest, and New Jersey has been represented in Democratic National Conventions by men of prominence. In several Conventions, indeed, the New Jersey Democrats have presented Presidential candidates for the consideration of their associates.

In the Minneapolis Republican Convention of 1892, it was the New Jersey Republicans, can Legislature may go far toward covering under the skilful direction of Gen. SEWELL, | a multitude of the sins against the people which who kept intact the Harmson line in the East, and made their delegation the rallying point for HARRISON'S Middle States supporters. Of 64 votes cast by Pennsylvania, 42 went to McKINLEY and only 19 to Gen HARRISON. Of 72 votes cast by New York, Gen. HARRISON received 27, Mr. BLAINE and Governor McKINLEY getting the remainder, 45. Gen. HARRISON received only 4 of the 12 votes of Connecticut, but New Jersey stood stiffly for the President's renomination, and gave him on the first ballot 18 of her 20 votes.

There appears to be as yet no declaration of Presidential preference among the New Jersey Republicans. Until the appearance of Gen. HARRISON'S letter of declination, they were counted in the HARRISON column along with Indiana.

M. MAUREI, is beyond doubt the greatest actor that ever sang on any stage, - l'oque. If our contemporary's experience had covered that of THE SUN, it would have been protected against such unfounded enthusiasm. MAUREL was at the beginning a noble singer and a good actor. Since the failure of his voice, like most artists in that condition, he has cultivated his acting assiduously. But when it comes to searching for the really great dramatic artists of the lyric stage, the first place must be accorded to another baritone, Roscost. He was an actor without affectation or extravagance, fit to stand with the highest. Even his worn voice

took on breadth and dignity from his action.

The Hon. George Graham Vest of Silver Hat, Mo., has devoted a portion of ink, valuable ink, and time to the composition of a letter to a friend; and the friend, knowing Mr. VEST's aversion to publicity, has naturally had the epistle published. Mr. VEST seems to be afraid that, in the whirlwind of enthusiam caused by his speeches in rapt celebration of the cartwheel dollar of the daddles, he might be caught up and dumped into the Governor's chair. Now Mr. VEST's ambition is to serve until the end of his term as a Senator in Congress, and after that to retire, if the Missourians let him, to retire and think. The Missourians are a good-natured set of folks. They will let him retire, and they will be pleased to see him taking up the habit of thinking.
Mr. VEST is not much more than half the age at which the distinguished Roman, the godfather of the Hon. CATO SELLS of Iowa, is said to have gone to a Greek kindergarten. There is good hope for Mr. VEST.

The epistle to a friend declares that Mr. VEST doesn't want to become, and under no circum-stances can be induced to become, a candidate for Governor. As the Missouri Democrats have had no wish to induce him, both they and he are of a mind, and peace returns in Missouri.

The great majority of the Republicans, faith-ful to the terms of the alliance with the money power, opposed the amendment and voted against free coin-age.—Afanta Constitution.

Let us put the sound money Democrats in with

the Republicans, in the alliance with the money power, and then confess that this alliance is a fact beyond a doubt. It represents every man who carns a little money, measured in cents or lollars, between sunrise and sunset. Every daily laborer is a part of the money power a much as the bloated monopolist who can bid fo bonds. He doesn't want his wages cut in half, any more than the bondholder wants to split The diplomatic correspondence of the last tion, does not specified it would be useless to Britain would not have extended her ave. so that the remark is all but tantamount to Legislature from that day until the present truly is a tremendous force. It runs the country,

THE GREATER NEW YORK.

The Political Consequences of the Passage of the Consolidation Bill.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Will not the passage of the Greater New York bill by this Legislature be of decided political advantage to the Republicans? Undoubtedly the proposed consolidation is supported by the Democrats; but of course, now that it is to be brought about during a period of Republican control of the State, its actual accomplishment will be put to the credit of that party; and, in my opinion, the result will be received with popular enthusiasm throughout the State. The expliation over it, too, will not be restricted by partisan lines, and will extend to every comnunity, and more particularly to the communities comprised in the Greater New York. At present there is atrong opposition to the consideration, but as it comes from Brooklyn, and since obviously that city would benefit most of all by the union, it can express no general and spontaneous popular feeling across the East River. The interests which have arrayed themselves most actively against the project seem to be governed by considerations which have little weight with the mass of the people. Hence, when the bill creating the Greater New York is passed and becomes law, I expect to see the event halled with popular demonstrations of approval which will be as general and as hearty in Brooklyn as in New York. From the beginning the scheme has appealed to the popular imagination, and when the consolidation has actually been declared by legislative act, the results accomplished will seem the more magnificent the nore the people reflect upon them. In saying this I have no purpose of expressing

r implying my individual opinion as to the

justice of the criticisms of the measure, though I will confess that the scheme of a Greater New York makes a strong appeal to my own imagination also. Moreover, is will be in accordance with a tendency which has become very general among large urban communities both at home and abroad: and that in the natural course of things the consulidation is bound to occur at some time in the future, seems to be the conviction even of those who are now most strenuously opposed to it. The earnest advocacy of the scheme by the Hon. Andrew H. Green as of immediate advantage seems to me also to be entitled to serious consideration at least. He has made the municipal problem a subject of special study during a long life, and his knowledge of the laws relating to this city more especially, and of its history and present condition and needs, is unquestionably more extensive and accurate than that of any other citizen. Whatever else may be said in disparagement of the Greater New York scheme, it cannot be truthfully described as wild and ill-considered. It has been in the mind of Mr. Green for many years, and has been maturely considered by him in all its bearings. I suppose that there is not an objection to it now raised which has not occurred to him and to which he has not given due weight; yet, with all his experience, all his knowledge, and after his long and thorough examination, Mr. Green is as entirely convinced of the great advantage consolidation will be to the communities concerned. as he is intelligent in the presentation of the reasons for the faith that is in him. Moreover, his interest in the scheme has been throughout wholly unselfish. He has had no political or personal ends of any kind to serve by consolidation. He has been animated imply by a sense of civic duty, unless, possibly, there has been joined with it an ambition to hold a place in the popular memory as the author of a project which will make New York in time the greatest city of the world.

As soon as the Greater New York is created, it will have a population exceeding three millions. This will make it the second city of the world in magnitude. London will come first, New York next, and Paris third, with the certainty that New York will hold the first place before the next century is far advanced, unless an improbable change occurs meanwhile in the tendency of population. The consciousness of this fact will appeal powerfully to the imaginations of the neo increase their local pride, and thus conduce to the advantage of the party giving them this greater importance in their own eyes, at least, as inhabitants of a city destined so soon to be the first in the world and already second only to the English capital.

I am not surprised, therefore, to see that Mr. Platt, who seems to have something of the discernment of statesmanship, is so strongly in favor of the passeage of the Greater New York bill. By making it law this Republiit will commit by other enactments. Ultimately, however, consolidation will foure to the political gain of the Democracy restored to the rightful control of the two great cities which it will unite MANHATTAN. NEW YORK, Feb. 20.

# GERMANS IN AMERICA.

The Heine Monument Shows Some to Be Still Foreigners.

To the Euron or The Sun-Mer. The Strate-Zeitung of Feb. in addresses the signers of the anti-Heine-Benkmal petition in the following sentences: "Who are you? None of you is seen when undertakings for Germons or humanity at large are planned! course, in matters of eatheries in genera, and the Heine-benkmal in special, you may have your own opinion. But it is a sharpe to oppose when all Genmany in New York says: This is so or so For the sake of decency you should keep your mouth shut."
To this one of the eleven signers would fain reply.

and he begs the other ten to permit him to use the

Five years after we arrived in America we swore, in the presence of the Supreme Being, that we wanted to be Americans and not Germans. This oath was not an unmeaning ceremony, but a guide of po-litical conduct for iffe. If, as you are pleased often to say, Hungarians, Italians, &c., do not know what they are doing on the occasion of unturalization, it besay, Hungarians, Italians, &c., do not know what they are doing on the occasion of usturalization, it behoves Germans to consider this solema act with the seriousness of full-grown men, and not with the seriousness of full-grown men, and not with the frivolity of half-witted human beings of a low order. You German editors, teach every day that the oath of allezinger has no significance if it stands between German inclinations and the duties of American citizenship. You preach day by day that everything proposed by Little Germany in America is without inriter question, morally an obligation for the rest of mankind, and constitutionally a law for America, because Germany is marching at the head of civil zation, and has musicians and thinkers which lead the world. By this kind of trash you inflate the unconcerned people of German decent, and you do incalculable wrong to your country and the people of your blood. This is simply disgusting to us. We thisk it according to the spirit of our mether Germania that after we have sworn fidelity to Columbia we loyally remain true to her in word and deed, although Little Germany blackguards us by using all the a say not only of our own, but mixed up, in Naute-Zeitung fashion, with the vulgar expressions of the English lanuage. If Little Germany wants a monument of self-admiration they shall not abuse licinich leine, or German virtue, or American citizonsing. remains neine, or derman virtue, or american cititenship.

Sone of us envies the standard bearers of Lithouse of us envies the standard bearers of Lithouse inhappy sotor men alive. At their wils' ends;
enclused of having led Little Germany into misfortune; rideculed by the press; curtailed in their salerica. They are objects of compassion, not of envy.
Enow Nothingism is for Little Germany leaders
what the bioody shirt used to be for carpet baggers—
a hiteans to advertise their little schemes. Let us all
try to be better Americans and do it by 'napiring the
less Americans with the best thoughts of great Germany).

EIN DEUTSCHER DER SICH SICHT VERBLUFFEN LASST.

Not Feeling Well Himself.

From the Chicago Dully Tribune. "Genius," said the lecturer, "too often is shortlived, while mediocrity lingers to a good old age. Methuselah did nothing worth mentioning, and lived till he was 009 years old. Virgil died at 51, Dante at 56, Shakespeare at 52, and Mollère at 51, At this point a wild, despairing cry came from the back part of the hall, and John Alfred McCracken, author of "Lines on Spring" and "Ode to Unc'e Le-onidas Horney's Old Brindle Cow," was found to have

# The Best He Could Do.

From the Presbyterian Journal.

Bobby struggled with the problem for an hour, and then presented for his mother's inspection the following truthful but unconventional effusion: "Mr. Robert Carbart declines with pleasure Miss Bussle Smith's invitation for the 14th, and thanks her extremely for having given him the opportunity for

Two Odlous Faults.

From the Chicago Daily News.

On the tastimony of fifty intelligent and observing young women a popular Chicago divine finds that the young men of this day and town have two grave the first they are concelled; and, second, they are lacking in deference to women.